

Remarks

Applicants would like to thank Examiner Md S. Elahee for the courtesy of a personal interview held with Applicants' representatives Michael D. Specht and Salvador M. Bezos on February 26, 2007, regarding the present application.

Reconsideration of this Application is respectfully requested.

Upon entry of the foregoing amendment, claims 10-18 and 56-82 are pending in the application, with claims 10, 56, 65, and 74 being the independent claims. Claim 10 is sought to be amended. New claims 56-82 are sought to be added. These changes are believed to introduce no new matter, and their entry is respectfully requested.

Based on the above amendment and the following remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claim 10 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0091056 to Surace *et al.* (now issued U.S. Patent No. 7,058,577) ("Surace"). Claims 10, 11, and 13 have been further rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,885,736 to Uppaluru ("Uppaluru").

Based on the above amendment and the personal interview held on February 26, 2007, Applicants believe the rejections of claim 10 over each of Surace and Uppaluru under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) have been overcome, and Applicants respectfully traverse. Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Dependent claims 11 and 13 are not anticipated by Uppaluru for at least the same reasons as independent claim 10 from which they depend, and further in view of their own respective features. Accordingly, the rejection of claims 11 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) is traversed and Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 11 - 18 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). The individual grounds of rejection are as follows:

- claim 11 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly obvious over Surace in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,301,339 to Staples *et al.* ("Staples");
- claim 12 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly obvious over Surace in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,189,702 to Sakurai *et al.* ("Sakurai");
- claim 13 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly obvious over Surace in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,768,508 to Eikeland ("Eikeland");
- claim 14 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly obvious over Surace in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,911,043 to Duffy *et al.* ("Duffy");
- claim 15 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly obvious over Surace in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,366,882 to Bijl *et al.* ("Bijl"); and
- claims 16-18 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly obvious over Surace in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,531,184 to Wigan *et al.* ("Wigan").

As described above, Surace does not teach or suggest all of the features of independent claim 10, as amended. Furthermore, Staples, Sakurai, Eikeland, Duffy, Bijl, and Wigan do not supply the missing teachings. Since Surace, Staples, Sakurai, Eikeland, Duffy, Bijl, and Wigan do not teach or suggest all of the features of

independent claim 10, either alone or in combination, the combination fails to support a *prima facie* case of obviousness of that claim. Dependent claims 11 - 18 are therefore not rendered obvious by Surace, Staples, Sakurai, Eikeland, Duffy, Bijl, and Wigan for at least the same reasons as independent claim 10 from which they depend, and further in view of their own respective features. Accordingly, the rejection of claims 11 - 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is traversed and Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 12 and 14 - 16 have been further rejected under the following individual grounds of rejection:

claim 12 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly obvious over Uppaluru in view of Sakurai;

claim 14 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly obvious over Uppaluru in view of Duffy;

claim 15 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly obvious over Uppaluru in view of Bijl; and

claim 16 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly obvious over Uppaluru in view of Wigan.

As described above, Uppaluru does not teach or suggest all of the features of independent claim 10, as amended. Furthermore, Sakurai, Duffy, Bijl, and Wigan do not supply the missing teachings. Since Uppaluru, Sakurai, Duffy, Bijl, and Wigan do not teach or suggest all of the features of independent claim 10, either alone or in combination, the combination fails to support a *prima facie* case of obviousness of that claim. Dependent claims 12 and 14 - 16 are therefore not rendered obvious by Uppaluru, Sakurai, Duffy, Bijl, and Wigan for at least the same reasons as independent claim 10 from which they depend, and further in view of their own respective features.

Accordingly, the rejection of claims 12 and 14 - 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is traversed and Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.

New Claims

Applicants seek to add new claims 56-82 in the above Amendment. New claims 56-82 are directed to a method, system, and computer program product for providing a voice interface, and should be allowed on similar grounds as claims 10-18. Accordingly, Applicants believe new claims 56-82 are presently in a condition for allowance.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of objection and rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicants believe that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment and Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C.



Lori A. Gordon
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 50,633

Date: 4-2-07

1100 New York Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005-3934
(202) 371-2600

627138_1.DOC